

## REMARKS

In response to the Ex-parte Quayle action of June 4, 2004, the Applicant has amended the Specification to cure the formal matter noted in sub-paragraph II of paragraph 3 in the Office Action. Accordingly, this objection is believed to be resolved.

With respect to the alleged objection given in sub-paragraph I of paragraph 3, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this objection.

The suggested change to the drawing which asks that the legend "Fig. 1" be added to the figure, would be in violation of the requirements of 37 CFR 1.84(u)(1), which mandates when a single view is used in an application the abbreviation "Fig." must not appear. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Additionally, paragraph III of the present Office Action asks that the letter "A" at the beginning of each of the dependent claims be deleted and replaced with the word "The." The Applicant respectfully submits that there is no proscription for starting a dependent claim with the word "A" and that such practice is ubiquitous in patent claiming. Indeed, in the MPEP examples of dependent claims, albeit multiple dependent claims, illustrate that the use of the word "A" is an acceptable beginning to a dependent claim (see MPEP §608.01(n)). Accordingly, the Applicant requests that this objection be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the objections have been addressed and resolved and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Patrick B. Law

Reg. No. 41,549

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: August 4, 2003